UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,296	09/09/2004	Masaaki Takamiya	RSW920040103US1 (308)	5295

46320   7590   02/20/2009
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
ABDUL-ALI, OMAR R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,9-13 and 15-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the Appeal Brief filed November 12, 2008. Claims

1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 are pending and have been considered below.

1. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-18 under 35

USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection

has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection

is made in view of the article 'Using Stylesheets' by Michael Kay further in view of Berry

et al. (US 2003/0145042).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over the articles 'Using Stylesheets' and 'XSL elements' by Michael Kay

further in view of Berry et al. (US 2003/0145042).

Claims 1, 7, and 13: Kay discloses a system for software instructions to display a user

interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet, comprising:

a. a client machine for:

retrieving the style sheet having user interface properties (XSL Elements,

page 3).

retrieving software instructions to be executed on the client machine

(Using Stylesheets, page 5).

retrieving a script for providing said software instructions access to the

style sheet (Using Stylesheets, page 5). Kay discloses specifying the style sheet for a

transformation by calling xslControl.setStylesheetParam("name", "value").

Kay discloses a processor for executing said software instructions on the client

machine, but does not explicitly disclose said software instructions call the script to

retrieve user interface properties, said software instructions, when executed, displaying

a user interface screen in accordance with the retrieved user interface properties. Berry

discloses a system for a single applet to communicate with multiple HTML elements

contained inside of multiple categories on a page that further discloses a client

application program (applet) receives a user interface update message from an agent

process and passes it to a script thereby facilitating the update of user interface

elements. The script is identified in an exemplary embodiment as the callback function

script, a dispatcher script and a general-purpose script. Individual callback function

scripts are dedicated to servicing particular user interface categories containing user

interface elements (page 4, paragraph 50). Therefore it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to call a script to

retrieve user interface properties in Kay. One would have been motivated to call a

script to retrieve user interface properties in order to retrieve user interface components

as they are updated at the server.

Kay further discloses the software instructions are disposed in a Java applet

(Using Stylesheets, page 5).

Claims 3, 9, and 15: Kay and Berry disclose a system for software instructions to

display a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as

in claim 1 above, and Kay discloses support for Javascript (page 17, XSL elements) but

neither reference explicitly discloses the script is a Javascript. However, Official Notice

is taken that Javascript is a well known scripting language, and it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

a Javascript for the script in Kay.   One would have been motivated to include Javascript

in the Kay system in view of the fact that Java is a widely used programming language

throughout the Internet and World Wide Web (WWW).

Claims 4, 10, and 16: Kay and Berry disclose a system for software instructions to

display a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as

in claim 3 above, and Kay further discloses the Java applet utilizes a Java-Javascript

API to call the Javascript (Using Style sheets, page 4).

Claims 5, 11, and 17: Kay and Berry disclose a system for software instructions to

display a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as

in claim 1 above, and <u>Kay</u> further discloses a server for delivering the style sheet, the script, and the software instructions. Though the server is not a portal application server, Official Notice is taken that portal application servers are old and well known in the computer arts for content delivery, and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this limitation in Kay. One would have been motivated to use a portal application server to deliver the content in Kay in order to provide a secure, manageable environment for accessing and interacting with enterprise software services and information resources.

Claims 6, 12, and 18: <u>Kay</u> and <u>Berry</u> disclose a system for software instructions to display a user interface according to user interface properties carried in a style sheet as in claim 5 above, and <u>Kay</u> further discloses the portal application server generates HTML having user interface components and associates the HTML with the style sheet, the system further comprising: a browser for displaying the user interface components according to the style sheet (Using style sheets, page 5).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Oracle Corporation "Oracle Application Server Portal" 10g (9.0.4) Product Overview, An Oracle White Paper" (Sep. 2003) pp. 1-9.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMAR ABDUL-ALI whose telephone number is (571)270-1694. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri(Alternate Fridays Off) 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OAA
2/17/2009

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178